

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 21, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the specification has been amended for better clarity.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for lack of headings. Applicants respectfully decline to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC 111(a), but per 37 CFR 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77"). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is

respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 11-12, 15 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 2, 11-12, 15 and 17 contain allowable subject matter. By means of the present amendment, claims 2, 11, 15 and 17 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 2, 11, 15 and 17 be allowed. Further, claim 12 should also be allowed at least based on its dependence from independent claim 11.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3-8, 10, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,471,379 (Bucher). Further, claims 9, 13-14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bucher. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-10, 13-14, 16 and 18-20 are patentable over Bucher for at least the following reasons.

Bucher is directed to a waveguide illumination assembly for an automobile license plate includes a single light source and a transport or waveguide disposed outward from the license plate

perimeter.

It is respectfully submitted that Bucher does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 16 which, amongst other patentable features, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

 said optical waveguide having ...at least one output surface for outputting a light beam portion that is being passed through the optical waveguide to the license plate and the at least one tail light; and

 at least one of a mirror and a lens configured to direct the light beam portion that is being passed through the optical waveguide to the license plate and the at least one tail light.

There is simple no teaching or suggestion in Bucher of optical waveguide having an one output surface for outputting a light beam portion to the license plate and the at least one tail light, let alone a mirror or a lens configured to direct the light beam portion passing through the optical waveguide to the license plate and to the at least one tail light, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 should be allowable. In additions, claims 3-10, 13-14 and 18-20 should be allowable at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 16.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 4, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101